

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 were pending. Claims 1, 8, 15, and 16 are independent. Claims 1, 5-6, 8, 12-13, 15, and 16 are currently amended. Claims 17-19 are added. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found in the applicant's specification at least at page 6, line 19 to page 7, line 9 and page 13, lines 8-25. Reconsideration of the action mailed January 25, 2007, is requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Interview Summary

The applicant wishes to thank the examiner for the courtesy of an interview conducted April 19, 2007. The time spent with the applicant's representatives, Brian J. Gustafson and Arrienne M. Lezak, was greatly appreciated. During the interview, the claims were discussed in light of the prior art. Recommendations were made by the examiner for overcoming the prior art. The recommendations have been incorporated into the claims as amended.

Section 101 Rejections

The examiner has rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. To expedite prosecution, and without prejudice, claims 1, 8, and 16 have been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1-14 and 16 is therefore respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 15, the examiner states that the recited steps occur entirely within the internals of a computer, and are therefore does not provide a useful result. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 15 recites a system that includes a desktop publishing processing control device, a display device displaying data being typeset, and input means for user input. Thus, claim 15 does not occur entirely within the internals of a computer. Instead, claim 15 requires particular devices of a system, which are useful, tangible, and concrete. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is statutory.

Section 112 Rejections

The examiner has rejected claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claims 15 and 16 recite determining whether a maximum dimension exceeds a specified grid dimension, and then selecting a current and a subsequent grid line. The examiner states that these actions are described in the specification as occurring only when a height dimension exceeds a certain threshold and not for all dimensions. As such, the examiner states that the claim is only enabled for height dimension in excess of a threshold and not all dimensions. The applicant has amended claims 15 and 16 for clarity and submits that the § 112, first paragraph rejection has been overcome.

Claims 15 and 16 also stand rejected under the second paragraph of § 112 as being indefinite. Specifically, the examiner states that the determining feature is not used in relation to the subsequent selection of a current and subsequent grid line. The applicant submits that claims 15 and 16, as amended, overcome the § 112, second paragraph rejection.

Section 103 Rejections

The examiner rejected claim 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,068,809 (“Verhelst”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,891,770 (“Hollett”).

Claims 1 and 8

To expedite prosecution, and without prejudice, claims 1 and 8 have been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 15

To expedite prosecution, and without prejudice, claim 15 has been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 16

To expedite prosecution, and without prejudice, claim 16 has been amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

Remaining Claims

The remaining claims depend from claims 1 and 8 and are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to those independent claims.

New Claims

Claims 17-19 are added. Claims 17-19 recite features corresponding to claims 2, 5, and 6. The applicant submits that these claims are allowable for the same reasons as claims 2, 5, and 6.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the forgoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does no acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicants' arguments for patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Applicant : Nathaniel M. McCully
Serial No. : 09/782,596
Filed : February 12, 2001
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-413001 / P377

The applicant requests a one-month extension of time. Please apply the required fee of \$120.00 and any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 30, 2007

/Brian J. Gustafson/
Brian J. Gustafson
Reg. No. 52,978

Customer Number: 21876
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50396516.doc